



Half-Truths and Reality about Pakistan's Secularism

Muhammad Umair Khan

Article: Half-Truths and Reality about Secular Pakistan.

By: Muhammad Umair Khan.

In recent years a vocal minority has emerged in Pakistan that abandons Pak Studies to fall for Hindustani propaganda. It's easier to do so because both follow the same version of history. The only difference is, Pak Studies asks you to be proud of your conservative past, while the Hindustani version of history portrays it as something negative. When a person changes his opinion about his country's origin or its founder from positive to negative, he comes under the impression of being enlightened, while his changed view is still based on distorted facts.

Apart from stealing Hindustani history, putting an Islamic label on it and asking children to be proud of it, most of Pakistan's convoluted history also owes much to deliberate and accidental misinterpretations. To eliminate the issue first certain terms and schools of thought need to be defined and explained properly, apart from their historical context. This includes Secularism, Islamic State, Muslim State, Theocratic State, Liberalism, Nationhood and the difference between religious references in individual capacity and religion as a strict state policy. Starting with Secularism, it has two variations: The first is Laicism; the second, British Liberalism.

The term Laicism (or Laïcité in French) was coined by French educator and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Ferdinand Buisson. Apart from the separation of the Church and the state, it also seeks to eliminate religion from the public domain. This form of Secularism (aka Militant Secularism) is inspired by the French Revolution and was adopted by Turkey under Mustafa Kemal Ataturk when the state forced Turks to change their lifestyle by force.

Pakistan's clergy and academics both refer to this form of Secularism when they claim that Mohammed Ali Jinnah wasn't a secular politician, which is a half-truth.

British Liberalism on the other hand comes from John Locke, an English philosopher and the founder of Classical Liberalism. This variation of Secularism promotes individuality, civil liberties and limited interference from the state. Locke was a staunch Christian who convinced his co-religionists to separate the Church and matters of the state by quoting religious texts as a justification. Unlike militant secularists, the followers of Locke believed in slow evolution and constitutional methods. They also opposed the eradication of religion from the public domain through the state and only opposed clergy dictating state policy and preventing it from observing impartiality. Jinnah was inspired by this branch of Secularism during his time as a young student in England.

John Morley was a great liberal politician of that era who later introduced Minto-Morley reforms in British India. Morley was also Locke's follower and his book 'On Compromise' was among Jinnah's favourite pieces of literature. Hence his famous quote, "Fortune smiled upon me as I happened to meet several important English liberals with whose help I came to understand the doctrine of Liberalism. The Liberalism of Lord Morley was then in full sway. I grasped that Liberalism, which became part of my life and thrilled me very much." (Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan by Hector Bolitho, page 9).

Through the Minto-Morley reforms, John Morley gave the idea of different groups in a divided society sharing power in the centre to form a united front. Jinnah closely observed these reforms and later used this school of

thought as a base for his Lucknow Pact, the Fourteen Points and finally the Lahore Resolution and acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan. All of these ideas took British India's diversity and centuries-old religious disputes into consideration to have temporary safeguards in the constitution for different communities to achieve co-existence through constitutional arrangements and evolution of the society instead of state-backed forced assimilation.

This was the reason why the All-India Muslim League opposed Gandhiji's educational system 'Wardha Scheme of Basic Education' in 1937. The scheme made the teaching of Satyagraha (aka the doctrine of non-violence) mandatory for all, and not just Caste Hindu students. Through this scheme a certain way of life was imposed on students 'to promote harmony' and to top it off, it was necessary for the Muslim students to worship Gandhiji on his birth anniversary. (Pirpur Report, circular, page 53).

Satyagraha had several troublesome features as well which were unacceptable. It prevented women from defending themselves during a sexual assault, it was against allies defending themselves against the Nazis, it asked the Western countries to offer their lands and women to invaders, it forbade Jews from self-defence against Hitler and so on. The main purpose of Satyagraha was to submit no matter the consequences and set an example of sacrifice to be remembered for all times to come. (Indian Summer: The Secret History of the End of an Empire (2007) by Alex von).

Naturally, this was considered impractical and concerns were raised by the minorities. In response, the Muslim League formed an eight-member committee to investigate the scheme and publish its findings. Apart from rejecting the state-led doctrine of non-violence, the committee also

concluded that the imposition of any ideology by the state, even for good purposes, eventually leads to intolerance and divisions because, in a diverse society, different groups and even individuals have their own version of the final truth. The report rejected the idea of telling the children what to think and instead promoted the idea of teaching them how to think. It stated that the educational system should offer "complete freedom of thought and freedom to express ideas, freedom to discuss the ideas to search for the truth and to proclaim it."

Laicism had made terms like Secularism and Liberalism quite controversial in British India, which is why despite standing for these two, the terms themselves were mostly avoided by liberal politicians. Nehru actually protested against the inclusion of the terms like Secularism and Socialism in the Hindustani constitution in 1947 despite the constitution being secular at its core. These words remained omitted from the Hindustani constitution for decades to come. Coming back to 1937, despite these terms being controversial, the League's committee directly mentioned them and stated, "The system of education should be based on liberal principles where no particular political creed or philosophy is given undue predominance." The merchants of self-hatred often state that the League was never straightforward in its support for Liberalism and Secularism which is dishonest, to say the least.

The report continued, "We are in no way condemning the doctrine of non-violence, but in an education scheme there must be scope for teaching different forms of political doctrines... A system of education which emphasises the superiority of one political ideal over others will encourage intolerance." This pretty much throws the idea of the 'Ideology of Pakistan' or 'Islamic Ideology' out of the window, the terms that first appeared in Pakistan's constitution in 1963. It further thought that in a diverse country

like British India, only that system of education can be successful which "teaches people to be tolerant of other people's views." The League's finding concluded that either all religions and doctrines should be taught in the same school or none of them should be taught. While promoting Secularism it claimed that "as long as impartiality is observed in the educational system, truly secular common institutions serve a useful purpose." (Muslims Under Congress Rule by KK Aziz, pages 187-202).

These views weren't just restricted to British India but a liberal educational system was also introduced in Pakistan. In November of 1947 early version of a new educational policy emerged. It promoted a mixture of Western and Eastern educational philosophies. And while teaching Islam's fundamental principles was made compulsory for Muslim college students, it was not the study of religion in a strict sense as it was introduced later on through Islamiat textbooks in the 1970s. The interpretation was modernist and humanist in nature. It stated that the study of Islam "should be based on the Islamic conception of universal brotherhood of man, social democracy and social justice" and "it must be catholic in outlook and must eschew sectarian or narrow doctrinal lines." The cultural exchange between Pakistan and other countries as well as the study of Buddhism and Indus Valley were also promoted.

Furthermore, it stated that the impression that Pakistan, being the state of Islam followers, "is a theocratic state is being sedulously fostered in certain quarters with the sole object of discrediting it in the eyes of the world." It criticised the concept of the Church and using religion as a state policy by continuing, "Islam has not sanctioned government by a sacerdotal class deriving its authority from God... The ruler far from being a vice-regent of God on earth is but a representative of the people who have chosen him to

serve them." (Pakistan Educational Conference 1947, record).

Later, to promote tolerance among different communities, it was decided that religious figures of all major religions would be taught. In the April of 1948, Dawn Newspaper reported a new syllabus which covered history and religion. "The spirit of toleration and understanding which is sought to be inculcated amongst the students is manifest from the fact that in the category of prophets and reformers besides the Muslim prophets, the lives of Krishna, Buddha and Guru Nanak are included. Stories about Mahatma Gandhi, Quaid-i-Azam, Maulana Mohammad Ali, Ibne Saud, Kemal Ataturk and Raja Ram Mohan Roy will be part of the study," the newspaper concluded. In 1954 then the official version of history appeared in the shape of Hector Bolitho's book 'Jinnah: Creator of Pakistan' which promoted the idea of liberal Pakistan and portrayed Jinnah as a follower of Classical Liberalism, or in other words, Secularism of the British variety. So it was a decent start for a society which had around a 10% literacy rate on the eve of independence and it was expected to evolve and become more enlightened in the future leading to more improvements.

The educational system was important to mention because it's one of the most important pillars of a civilised society as it lays the foundation for future generations. For example: If the educational system is liberal and secular then the politicians that will emerge under it will also be from the same school of thought and the state created by them will be liberal and secular, and if the educational system promotes so-called 'Ideology of Pakistan' as it's happening since the 60s then the society and constitutional amendments brought by its politicians will also be ultra-conservative.

Although what's being taught in the schools is important, Jinnah's

commitment to moderate Secularism which he learned during Victorian era England wasn't just limited to the educational system. In All-India Muslim League's Manifesto from 1936, it's defined in clear terms that it not only aimed at promoting liberal values among Muslims but also wanted to go a step further to protect their economic interests and uplift them socially. Apart from these, the Manifesto also aimed at reducing military expenditure and having low taxes, free and compulsory education, rights of workers, civil liberties and so on. "New problems have arisen today. It is not only a question of educating the middle class of the Muslims in India on Western lines and providing them with jobs; it is not only a question of infusing in them the ideals of Victorian Liberalism; on the contrary, the present conditions compel us to go much deeper into the problems of entire social regeneration of seventy millions of Muslims and extricating them from the terrible poverty, degradation and backwardness into which they have fallen and giving them at least the rudiments of a civilised existence and making them free citizens of a free land," the Manifesto read. These words were never contradicted in the future sessions of the Muslim League. In some cases, they added more details on top. (Muslims Under Congress Rule by KK Aziz, pages 55-7).

Different states have different kinds of religious issues, and to solve them they adopt different forms of Secularism to observe impartiality. In England Protestant Christianity is the official religion and the monarch has to be a Protestant Christian; however, the Chief Executive can be of any religion and the constitution promotes equal rights for its citizens. It's a Christian state culturally, which means the calendar, economic system, traditions, holidays, moral values etc are derived from Christianity, but it's impartial at the same time, which is the main reason behind a Hindu being their Prime Minister and Muslim the mayor of London at the moment. Similarly, Denmark officially recognises the Lutheran Church and directs the state to protect their Christian values. In reality, Denmark is considered one of the

most secular states on earth with the highest living standards and one of the most non-religious societies. Bangladesh classifies itself as a secular state but has Islam as the state religion. If there's a contradiction or a clash then the state upholds Secularism. The United States is a secular state but it doesn't use that word in the constitution. Instead, its First Amendment, which promises freedom to practise any religion, classifies it as a secular state in the eyes of the world despite having one of the most conservative societies in the West.

Similarly, Pakistan had its own version of Secularism when it came into being in 1947. On the request of Quaid-i-Azam, the references to God were removed from the oaths of the Prime Minister, Governor-General and other offices. The word 'Swear' was also replaced with 'Affirm'. In other secular states, theists swear an oath while non-believers affirm. Often the Holy Book belonging to the religion of the office holder is also used during the oath-taking ceremony. Jinnah removed religious oaths entirely; so, even a theist had to affirm the oath like a non-believer. This was done to keep religious matters personal, so even during an oath-taking ceremony a person isn't forced to reveal his religious beliefs. Apart from prioritisation of competence over religious beliefs, it was also good for safety purposes. Ahmadis played a vital role in the creation of Pakistan and the atheists of South India from Shudra Caste were also against Congress and were allies of the Muslim League. Jinnah most likely wanted their lives and careers to be protected in a conservative society by keeping their views on religion a secret. He himself also affirmed an oath like a non-believer when he took charge of the Governor-General's office to set an example, even though he was a Muslim. (Transfer of Power Papers Volume 12, page 647. Jinnah Papers Volume 5, page 6).

Pakistan's constituent assembly's first session was launched by a Hindu as

acting chairperson. Similarly, the first Minister of Law and Labour was also the same Hindu who was no expert in writing laws for the Islamic Theocracy. Meanwhile, Jinnah also refused to have a state religion in Pakistan and his cabinet also lacked the Ministry of Religious Affairs. What happened afterwards, including the 11 August Speech where he said that a person "may belong to any religion, caste or creed, that has nothing to do with the business of the state" was just the icing on the cake as the actions speak louder than words when it comes to a politician.

Certain academics claim that the 11 August Speech is the only occasion on which Jinnah spoke of impartiality. This is a weak argument because the foundation for a secular state was already set and even the 11 August Speech was not necessary to prove Quaid-i-Azam's secular credentials. However, the claim itself isn't true either. Let's take his speech on Pakistan's real independence day, 15 August 1947, as an example. "Citizens of Pakistan! It is with feelings of greatest happiness and emotion that I send you my greetings. August 15 is the birthday of the independent and sovereign State of Pakistan... The creation of the new State has placed a tremendous responsibility on the citizens of Pakistan. It gives them an opportunity to demonstrate to the world how a nation, containing many elements, can live in peace and amity and work for the betterment of all its citizens, irrespective of caste or creed," he said. (Statements and Speeches as Governor General of Pakistan 1947-48, page 55).

In the same speech, he wished Muslims Jumat-ul-Widha, which too is interpreted as something against Secularism. It's safe to say it's desperation at best. It's like blaming the Canadian Prime Minister for wishing Christmas to its Christian citizens or Ramzan to Muslims. Speaking of Christians, on 17 August 1947, just two days after the independence, Jinnah took part in prayers at a Church in Karachi to once again practically prove that Pakistan

was a country for everyone. (Indian Summer (1951) by Russell Wilfrid, page 127).

He often took part in Hindu festivals, mainly the Ganesh festival held by Tilak, during his days in Congress as well. Needless to say, Jinnah remained consistent in his habits. He spoke some of his last words during an interview with Saturday Evening Post on 17 July 1948. When asked about the role of Islam in state policy he impatiently responded, "I am not interested in the religious aspect; that is not in my line." In multiple talks throughout his remaining life, he referred to his address to the constituent assembly on 11 August 1947 and claimed that he made it pretty clear what sort of state Pakistan was going to be.

There are at least around three dozen speeches of Quaid-i-Azam after Pakistan's independence that promote Secularism. Let's take one random address from 3 February 1948. He spoke, "I assure you that Pakistan means to stand by its oft-repeated promises of according equal treatment to all its nationals irrespective of their caste and creed. Pakistan which symbolises the aspirations of a nation that found itself in a minority in the Indian subcontinent cannot be unmindful of the minorities within its own borders." Jinnah explained the difference between practising religion on an individual level or having a soft corner for another Muslim and state policy very well just a few days later on 19 February 1948. While talking about Muslims of Pakistan, he said, "The great majority of us are Muslims. We follow the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). We are members of the Brotherhood of Islam in which all are equal in rights, dignity and self-respect. Consequently, we have a special and a very deep sense of unity. But make no mistake: Pakistan is not a theocracy or anything like it." (Statements and Speeches as Governor General of Pakistan

1947-48, page 131. Ibid, pages 149-50).

Most of the time Jinnah used the term "Muslim State" for Pakistan but a handful of times he also used the term "Islamic State." In recent decades, due to the war on terror, a new trend has emerged where a person from a secular state has to explain that his country is Muslim and not Islamic. That wasn't the case in the past as both terms were used interchangeably most of the time. The proper term for a religious state is 'Theocratic State' or 'Theocracy'. Whenever Jinnah used the term Islamic State, he clarified in the following sentences that by that he merely meant a state of Muslim majority that followed the principles of social justice, equality and brotherhood as taught by Islam instead of a religious state with regressive laws. "Pakistan is the premier Islamic State and the fifth largest in the world... Islam has taught equality of men, justice and fair play to everybody. We are the inheritors of these glorious traditions... In any case, Pakistan is not going to be a theocratic state to be ruled by priests with a divine mission. We have many non-Muslims... but they are all Pakistanis. They will enjoy the same rights and privileges as any other citizens and will play their rightful part in the affairs of Pakistan," he explained. (Ibid, pages 155-7).

He used the term "Islamic" for Turkey as well, even though it was a secular state. In fact, in the same speech he used the words 'Muslim' and 'Islamic' interchangeably for it. "Another great figure, a world figure, that has passed away is Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. His death has come as the greatest blow to the Muslim World. He was the foremost figure in the Muslim East... In Kemal Ataturk, the Islamic world has lost a great hero. With the example of this great Musalman in front of them as an inspiration, will Muslims of India still remain in a quagmire?" he said while missing the late Ataturk. (Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the Nation's Voice, towards

consolidation, Speeches and Statements 1935-1940, page 327).

There is a famous incident of Jinnah with the Raja of Mehmudabad where the former said that Pakistan would "not be an Islamic State" but a "Liberal Democratic Muslim State." It's important to remember that in this case, Jinnah criticised Mehmudabad's interpretation of the Islamic State as the exact words the latter used were "Islamic State with the Sunnah and Sharia as its bedrock" and not just an Islamic State with the Muslim majority.

Another example of both words being used interchangeably is the prominent former Muslim Leaguer Sirdar Shaukat Hyat Khan's book 'The Nation that Lost its Soul'. In it, he described Pakistan as a "Liberal Islamic State." Jinnah's greatest adversary Jawaharlal Nehru also used to call Turkey a secular Islamic State. In his letter to a Leaguer SA Latif, dating 25 December 1939, Nehru stated, "Where democracy is creeping into the Islamic States, it is on the basis of modern scientific political theory which separates the state from religion, though keeping religion intact for the individual and the group. Turkey is an outstanding example of an Islamic State." (Jinnah Papers Volume 15, page 33).

Another example of Jinnah's words taken out of context is when he asked the people, "If we take our guidance and inspiration from the Holy Quran, the final victory, I once again say, will be ours." The parts before it and the ones after it are omitted and it's not told that he uttered these words during Hindu-Muslim riots in Punjab to discourage mob rule. He claimed that the "systematic massacre of defenceless and innocent people puts to shame even the most heinous atrocities committed by the worst of tyrants known to history." He then asked Muslims to take guidance and inspiration from the Holy Quran to defeat radical elements within their own ranks

because the "tenets of Islam enjoin on every Musalman to give protection to his neighbours and to the minorities regardless of the caste and creed." However, this great message is used to imply that he was talking about using religion as a state policy. (Statements and Speeches as Governor General of Pakistan 1947-48, pages 93-5).

Similarly, his comments about the Shariat Application Act 1937 of the Government of India Act 1935, which dealt with Muslim Personal Laws like marriage, divorce, property inheritance etc, are used to make a point for Sharia Law. The same goes for him stating that "Islam and its idealism taught us democracy 1300 years ago," hence, it'd be wrong to say that Pakistan would clash with Islam. This was a response to his followers who stated that Muslims under no condition would be ready to accept democracy in Pakistan because it was a Western construct and against their Islamic culture. This is shown as proof that Quaid-i-Azam wanted no laws in Pakistan that had the potential to clash with religion. It's often used as a justification for the existence of religious advisories and authorities like the Council of Islamic Ideology and the Federal Shariat Court. Jinnah chose his words carefully but had he known that after his death his words would be misused he would've been even more careful. However, one can't foresee the future and when society is ignorant, a politician has no choice but to respond in the vocabulary it understands best.

This was also done by Ataturk, even though he was inspired by Laicism instead of British Liberalism. In the early years of Modern Turkey he, unlike Jinnah, had declared Islam as the state religion and he was of the opinion that "the Mohamedan religion includes the freedom of religious opinion," hence, the state religion wouldn't clash with Turkey's secular structure. It took him a long time to change the society's mindset. (The Great Speech by

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk).

Nehru did something even more controversial by inaugurating the statue of Shivaji Maharaj, the hero of radical Hindu Nationalists, as Prime Minister of Hindustan. He called him the "ruler of the entire Bharat" to glorify Akhand Bharat and please extreme right-wing elements within Congress. But both Ataturk and Nehru had plenty of time as they ruled their countries for around 15 years and made sure that the new system was strong enough to stand the test of time. Jinnah didn't enjoy the same luxury as he passed away just a year after Pakistan's creation and even during his lifetime, he started to lose his power due to sickness and conspiracies. This included attempts to censor his speeches, mutiny in the army and his fake quotes in the newspapers while he was on his deathbed among others.

Then the question arises: What was the Two Nation Theory? In short, the Caste Hindu revivalists of the 19th century were the first in British Raj to identify themselves as a separate nation. Historically, a nation is just a group of people who have something in common. Merely classifying themselves as a nation is not an issue. The issue was that they thought that only the Hindu nation deserved to live in India. As their leader, Nabagopal Mitra, in 1872, clearly stated, "Hindus are a nation... The basis of national unity in India is the Hindu religion." (Saha, Panchanan (2007). Hindu-Muslim relations in a new perspective).

He helped co-found an organisation called Bharat Dharma Mahamandal. Its aim was to create a Hindu Raj in the subcontinent. This organisation later led to the creation of other radical organisations including then Congress' militant wing Hindu Mahasabha and RSS. Congress' prominent leader and Gandhiji's close associate, Bhai Parmanand, conceptualised the concept of

separate sovereign states for Hindus and Muslims as early as 1909 and he also envisioned a complete transfer of population between both states.

"The territory beyond Sindh could be united with North-West Frontier Province into a great Musulman Kingdom. The Hindus of the region should come away, while at the same time, the Musulmans in the rest of the country should go and settle in this territory," said Parmanand in 1909. (Parmanand, Bhai. The Story of My Life, page 41).

Then in 1924, Lala Lajpat Rai, another prominent leader from Congress also suggested the partition of provinces on top. "Punjab should be partitioned into two provinces, Western Punjab with a large Muslim majority to be Muslim governed province, and Eastern Punjab with a large Hindu-Sikh majority to be a non-Muslim governed province... It should be distinctly understood that this is not United India. It means clear partition of India into Muslim India and a non-Muslim India," he said. Both Parmanand and Rai were Punjabi non-Muslims but were fine with the partition of Punjab between sovereign states of Muslims and Hindus. In the case of Rai in 1924, he actually endorsed it as a great solution. Six years later Iqbal demanded a Muslim province (aka autonomous state) within All-India Federation, and ten years afterwards Lahore Resolution was moved after two years of Congress rule which apart from state-led persecution of minorities also saw the Wardha Scheme of Education as mentioned earlier. (The Tribune article, 14 December 1924).

Due to the exclusivist interpretation of the Two Nation Theory by the Caste Hindu revivalists, it is also called the One Nation Theory by some. In response, Jinnah, just a few weeks before the Lahore Resolution, also classified Muslims as another nation in the subcontinent to promote the idea of mutual cooperation on equal footing. He stated, "A constitution must be evolved that recognises that there are in India two nations who

both must share the governance of their common motherland." This was later distorted into, "Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations who can't live together." (Time and Tide article, 19 January 1940).

Lahore Resolution itself was quite vague about the details but during his speech on this event, Jinnah refused to use the word 'Sovereign' for "independent states" of Muslims and only called for dividing India into "Autonomous National States," which hinted at one federation with three autonomous zones, two of them Muslim majority and one Hindu majority. In the coming years, Jinnah used Sovereign Pakistan as maximum demand but he also rejected Sovereign Pakistan thrice when it was offered in 1942, 1944 and 1946 by Rajagopalacharia, Gandhiji and the British establishment.

On 6 June 1946, Muslim League unanimously adopted the resolution and accepted one federation with three autonomous zones but the scheme offered a decentralised structure which was unacceptable to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel, who thought it would be better to let Pakistan areas go their own way but not without partitioned Punjab and Bengal. This scheme, which was a carbon copy of Lala Lajpat Rai's scheme of 1924, was bitterly opposed by the League but in the end, the final version of Pakistan that emerged on the map was this one. In simple words, both Jinnah and Nehru wanted a secular state but the main difference between both was that the former wanted more power for provinces while the latter preferred centre to have greater control.

Some people say that the separation of Bengal from Pakistan proved Jinnah wrong, while in reality, it proved him right because Lahore Resolution talked of two Muslim-majority zones and in 1946 the federation they accepted also offered two Muslim-majority zones and one Hindu-majority

zone. After Bengal lost Calcutta, a major economic hub, in the partition of the province, the region was merged with North-Western zones as East Pakistan because Bengal's survival without support from a port like Karachi was in question. Till the beginning of June 1947, roughly two months before independence, Jinnah wanted Bengal to be a separate entity with Calcutta intact. The name 'PAKISTAN' also didn't include a representation of Bengal in Chaudhry Rehmat Ali's original scheme who had coined the said name.

After Jinnah's death, Liaquat Ali Khan tabled the Objectives Resolution, which wasn't as progressive as Jinnah's views but wasn't a call for a theocracy either. Liaquat Ali Khan faced an alliance of mullahs who demanded a Theocratic State which would derive its authority from the Church, have no place for democracy and have full-blown Sharia Law. They threatened him with violent protests while Pakistan was still stuck in the Kashmir valley. Liaquat, who got an unstable Pakistan riddled with separatist movements and a crumbling economy and had a great task of unifying the country lying ahead of him, tabled the Objectives Resolution which stated that while sovereignty belonged to God, He gave the power to the people of Pakistan to choose their elected representatives within limits.

Liaquat rejected the main demands of the mullahs but added a few catchy words in the resolution to minimise the damage. According to Liaquat, Objectives Resolution wouldn't become a substantive part of the constitution and was only tabled as a rough road map until the new constitution was complete. It did speak of enabling Muslims to live their lives according to Quran and Sunnah in an "individual" capacity, but it didn't say that it'd be something compulsory imposed by the state. Non-Muslims were also offered complete freedom to practise their religion and propagate their views freely.

After Liaquat's assassination, everyone interpreted the resolution as they saw fit. When misinterpretation didn't work they removed the words like "freely" from it to stop non-Muslims from propagating their views openly. There were other great things in the resolution that were ignored entirely, like complete provincial autonomy. Instead, the state adopted one unit system. People cherry-picked their favourite parts and misinterpreted the others or ignored them entirely to suit their agendas. It's important to notice that the resolution itself was inspired by the European states of that time. Ireland today classifies itself as a secular democracy but its original preamble which is still part of its constitution contains more religious references than Objectives Resolution, which later became the preamble of Pakistan's constitution and finally its substantive part.

It says, "In the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, from Whom is all authority and to Whom, as our final end, all actions both of men and States must be referred, We, the people of Eire, humbly acknowledge all our obligations to our Divine Lord, Jesus Christ, Who sustained our fathers through centuries of trial, gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to regain the rightful independence of our Nation, and seeking to promote the common good, with due observance of Prudence, Justice and Charity, so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, the unity of our country restored, and concord established with other nations, do hereby adopt, enact, and give to ourselves this Constitution."

Ireland's constitution also directs the state to protect the institution of marriage. Similarly, the King in England can only be protestant and its constitution orders the state to protect their Christian values. Meanwhile,

Denmark's constitution classifies itself as a monarchy. American constitution contains multiple references to God. But all of these states are secular at their core today because they observe impartiality and a lot of things have become ceremonial. No one gets imprisoned for a pre-marital affair in Ireland, nor the state of England stops a Hindu from becoming the Prime Minister.

As First Lady Ra'ana Liaquat, one of the founders of Pakistan, in her interview with Herald said that Pakistan was "not the religious" kind of state but a "liberal kind." She further explained, "Pakistan was visualised as secular and democratic. Today Pakistan is out and out a theocracy." Similarly, the closest person to Quaid-i-Azam, his sister Fatima Jinnah wrote in her book, "He [Jinnah] spoke to me about his anxiety that a new constitution should be framed, which would be liberal, and ensure fundamental freedoms to the people of Pakistan, and that he hoped to complete this task in about two years... It was very irritating to his sensitive mind that this all-important task was being delayed due to his recurring illness." (Herald Interview titled 'Corruption within the ranks', 1984. My Brother by Fatima Jinnah, page 17).

Her claims also check out when we look at the changes Jinnah made to the oaths to observe impartiality and keep religion private. On 25 August 1947, in his interview with Collier's Weekly, Jinnah stated the same that it'd take around two years to complete Pakistan's constitution and that his views were against religious orthodoxy. (Jinnah Papers Volume 5, pages 118-22).

